

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF ALABAMA
NORTHERN DIVISION

AKRAM IBIN FAREED, #214664,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	CASE NO. 2:21-CV-126-WHA-KFP
)	(WO)
KAY IVEY, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

RECOMMENDATION OF THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Plaintiff, an inmate confined at the Staton Correctional Facility, recently initiated this 42 U.S.C. § 1983 case challenging numerous actions during his confinement at several different correctional facilities. Doc. 1. Upon screening the Complaint and based on deficiencies in the Complaint, the Court ordered Plaintiff to file an amended complaint by March 11, 2021. Doc. 4 at 5. The Court provided Plaintiff specific instructions as to filing the amended complaint and warned Plaintiff that his failure to file an amended complaint would result in a recommendation that this case be dismissed. *Id.* at 5–6.

Plaintiff has not filed an amended complaint as ordered by the Court, which reflects a lack of interest in prosecuting this case. This case cannot proceed without Plaintiff's participation. Under these circumstances, the Court finds that lesser sanctions than dismissal are not appropriate. *See Abreu-Velez v. Bd. of Regents of Univ. Sys. of Ga.*, 248 F. App'x 116, 117–18 (11th Cir. 2007). Thus, this case is due to be dismissed. *Tanner v. Neal*, 232 Fed. App'x 924 (11th Cir. 2007) (affirming *sua sponte* dismissal without prejudice of inmate's § 1983 action for failure to file amended complaint in compliance

with court's order and warning of consequences for failure to comply); *Moon v. Newsome*, 863 F.2d 835, 837 (11th Cir. 1989) (holding that, as a general rule, where a litigant has been forewarned dismissal for failure to obey a court order is not an abuse of discretion); *see also Link v. Wabash R.R. Co.*, 370 U.S. 626, 629–31 (1962) (acknowledging that the authority of courts to impose sanctions for failure to prosecute or obey an order is longstanding and empowers courts “to manage their own affairs so as to achieve the orderly and expeditious disposition of cases.”); *Mingo v. Sugar Cane Growers Co-Op of Fla.*, 864 F.2d 101, 102 (11th Cir. 1989) (holding that a district court “possesses the inherent power to police its docket” and that “sanctions imposed [upon dilatory litigants] can range from a simple reprimand to an order dismissing the action with or without prejudice”).

Accordingly, it is the RECOMMENDATION of the Magistrate Judge that this case be dismissed without prejudice for Plaintiff's failure to file an amended compliant as ordered by the Court. It is further

ORDERED that on or before **April 14, 2021**, the parties may file objections to the Recommendation. The parties must specifically identify the factual findings and legal conclusions in the Recommendation to which objection is made. Frivolous, conclusive, or general objections will not be considered by the Court. The parties are advised that this Recommendation is not a final order and, therefore, is not appealable.

Failure to file written objections to the Magistrate Judge's findings and recommendations in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) will bar a party from a de novo determination by the District Court of legal and factual issues covered in the Recommendation and waive the right of the party to challenge on appeal the District

Court's order based on unobjected-to factual and legal conclusions accepted or adopted by the District Court except on grounds of plain error or manifest injustice. *Nettles v. Wainwright*, 677 F.2d 404 (5th Cir. 1982); 11TH CIR. R. 3-1. *See Stein v. Reynolds Sec., Inc.*, 667 F.2d 33 (11th Cir. 1982); *see also Bonner v. City of Prichard*, 661 F.2d 1206 (11th Cir. 1981) (en banc).

DONE this 31st day of March, 2021.

/s/ Kelly Fitzgerald Pate

KELLY FITZGERALD PATE

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE